

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1459 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/645,226 | 08/21/2003 | Steve Lin | DES/1250.0030 | 7137 |
| 152 | 7590 11/17/20 | 94 | EXAMINER | |
| CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, MCCLUNG & STENZEL 1600 ODS TOWER | | | SMALLEY | , JAMES N |
| 601 SW SECOND AVENUE | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| PORTLAND, OR 97204-3157 | | 3727 | | |

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 41 4 | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|---|--------------|--|--|--|
| | 10/645,226 | LIN, STEVE | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | James N Smalley | 3727 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Ju | ily 2004. | | | | |
| 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b)☐ This | action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1.5 Report and Todomyth Office. | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/645,226

Art Unit: 3727

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson US 6,530,493 in view of Uhlig US 4,533,058.

Anderson '493, fig.s 10 and 12, teach a container and closure, with a flip top cap (16A), tear strip (40), threaded cap (14A), and sealing flange (46) sealing a container circumferential lip.

Anderson '493 does not teach ratchet teeth, instead disclosing a tamper proof ring (13A).

Uhlig '058 teaches it is known to provide a ratchet tooth connection between a threaded cap and associated container neck (see fig. 5). Examiner cites Official Notice that these two means of preventing tampering of a threaded cap are well known mechanical equivalents.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the container closure assembly of Anderson '493, replacing the tamper evident ring with a ratchet tooth connection, motivated by the benefit of preventing access to the container. One having ordinary skill would have found it obvious to substitute a ratchet tooth connection for a tamper evident ring because these two means of preventing tampering with a threaded cap are art-recognized equivalents and it is within ordinary skill to substitute one well known tamper evident means for another.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 19 July 2004, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC 102(b) over Ostrowsky US 4,487,324 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

The rejection has been withdrawn.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,226

Art Unit: 3727

4. Applicant's arguments filed 19 July 2004, with respect to the rejection of Anderson US 6,530,493 in view of Uhlig US 4,533,058 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the combination does not result in both a frangible strip and ratchettoothed rings in both the container and the cap.

Examiner notes the rejection was made to modify the container and closure cap of Anderson '493, replacing tamper proof ring (13A) with the ratchet tooth connection taught by Uhlig US 4,533,058. The resultant structure creates both a frangible strip (element (40) on Anderson '493) and ratchet tooth rings (cap ratchet toothed ring (26) within the cap (11), and container neck ring (27), both of Uhlig '058).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James N Smalley whose telephone number is (703) 605-4670. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9-7:30, Alternate Fri 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee Young can be reached on (703) 308-2572. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,226

Art Unit: 3727

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jns

STEPHEN CRONIN PRIMARY EXAMINER